UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Abraham Linder,	Civil Action No.:
Plaintiff,	
V	
Torres Credit Services, Inc.; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	COMPLAINT
Defendants.	

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Abraham Linder, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

- 1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendant and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
 - 2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Abraham Linder ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

- 5. The Defendant, Torres Credit Services, Inc. ("TCS"), is a Pennsylvania business entity with an address of 27 Fairview Street, Suite 103, Carlisle, Pennsylvania 17013, operating as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
- 6. Does 1-10 (the "Collectors") are individual collectors employed by TCS and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.
 - 7. TCS at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

- 8. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the "Debt") to HSBC (the "Creditor").
- 9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a "debt" under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).
- 10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to TCS for collection, or TCS was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.
- 11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in "communications" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. TCS Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

- 12. Beginning in or around September 2012, TCS started contacting Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt by placing numerous calls daily to Plaintiff's cellular telephone.
- 13. During the initial telephone conversation and all those thereafter, Plaintiff requested TCS cease all calls until TCS provided proper validation of the Debt.

- 14. Despite such requests, TCS continued to hound Plaintiff with telephone calls in its collection efforts.
- 15. During one conversation, TCS rudely told Plaintiff to "pay your f***ing bills," much to Plaintiff's shock and annoyance.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

- 16. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.
- 17. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, ET SEQ.

- 18. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 19. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 20. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2) in that Defendants used profane language when speaking with the consumer.
- 21. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.
- 22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.

- 23. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.
 - 24. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II

<u>VIOLATIONS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA FAIR CREDIT EXTENSION</u> UNIFORMITY ACT, 73 P.S. § 2270, ET SEQ.

- 25. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
 - 26. The Plaintiff is a "consumer," as defined in 73 P.S. § 2270.3.
- 27. The Defendants are each individually a "debt collector" as defined in 73 P.S. § 2270.3.
- 28. The Defendants violated provisions of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq., which constitutes an unfair or deceptive practice under 73 P.S. § 2270.4(a).
 - 29. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

COUNT III

INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

- 30. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 31. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes…upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."

- 32. Pennsylvania further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus the Defendants violated Pennsylvania state law.
- 33. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing Plaintiff with the above-referenced telephone calls.
- 34. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, "hounding the plaintiff," and, "a substantial burden to her existence," thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.
- 35. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.
- 36. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.
- 37. All acts of the Defendants and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, the Defendants are subject to punitive damages.

COUNT IV

<u>VIOLATIONS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES AND CONSUMER PROTECTION LAW, 73 P.S. § 201-1, ET SEQ.</u>

- 38. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 39. The Defendants' violations of the Pennsylvania Fair Credit Extension Uniformity

 Act constitute per se violations under the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer

 Protection Law.

- 40. The Defendants' acts were done with malicious, intentional, willful, reckless, wanton and negligent disregard for Plaintiff's rights under the law.
- 41. As a result of the Defendants' violations, the Plaintiff has suffered ascertainable losses entitling the Plaintiff to actual, statutory and treble damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

- 1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
- 2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
- 3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) and 73 P.S. § 2270.5 against the Defendants;
- 4. Statutory damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 2270.5(c);
- 5. Actual damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
- 6. Statutory damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
- 7. Treble damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
- 8. Actual damages from the Defendants for all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
- 9. Punitive damages; and
- 10. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: May 3, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

By <u>/s/ JBB8445</u>

Jody B. Burton, Esq. Bar No.: 71681 LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C. 1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor Stamford, CT 06905 Telephone: (203) 653-2250

Facsimile: (203) 653-3424 Attorneys for Plaintiff